## REMARKS

The Applicant gratefully acknowledges the thorough examination to date, and has made an effort to fully respond to all of the issues raised by the Examiner. Applicant has taken care and believes that no new matter has been introduced by way of this response. Reconsideration of the application in view of the following amendments and remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 – 164 of this application are still pending. The Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 41, 93, and 124 to further expressly define that the total market value of the take home currency provided to the players by the entrance-exchange structure is greater than or equal to the total market value of currency bet by the players of the entrance-exchange structure. Furthermore, with respect to claims 93 and 124, Applicant has further expressly defined that i is greater than or equal to 1 with respect to the scrip-to-items exchange rate $E^{S \rightarrow I}{}_{i}$ for at least one item provided by the outside vendor $V_i$ .

The Applicant is not conceding in this patent application that the original and previously presented claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, since the claim amendments are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of this patent application. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to pursue said amended and previously presented claims, and other claims, in one or more continuations and/or divisional patent applications.

**35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

The Examiner rejected claims 1-21, 26-34, 37, 41-61, 66-74, 77, 93-104, 109-117, 120, 124-135, 140-148, 151, and 155-159 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Weiss (U.S. Patent No. 6,511,377 B1) in further view of OFFICIAL NOTICE.

Applicant respectfully contends that currently amended claims 1-21, 26-34, 37, 41-61, 66-74, 77, 93-104, 109-117, 120, 124-135, 140-148, 151, and 155-159 are non-obvious and patentable over Weiss in view of the OFFICIAL NOTICE because Weiss in view of the OFFICIAL NOTICE does not teach, disclose, or suggest each and every element of the claims. Weiss in view of the OFFICIAL NOTICE does not teach or suggest that "the total market value of the take home currency provided to the players by the entrance-exchange structure is greater than or equal to the total market value of currency bet by the players of the entrance-exchange structure." Independent claims 1, 41, 93 and 124 have been amended to include this limitation. Applicant has taken care to assure that no new matter has been added with this limitation. Support for this amendment may be found beginning on page 9, line 9 of the originally filed application where an example is given whereby a player is paid, on average, $0.80 in cash and $0.25 in scrip for every dollar bet. Next, in the Example beginning on page 11, line 11 of the originally filed application, the $1.00 of scrip has a market value of $1.00 (or greater than $1.00 in the $1.10 example). Combining these examples, the total market value of the take home currency provided to the players by the entrance-exchange structure is greater than or equal to the total market value of currency bet by the players of the entrance-exchange structure. None of the references cited by the Examiner teach this limitation. While Weiss may teach providing "scrip" to players for gambling, Weiss does not teach that the market value of the scrip plus currency paid to a player on average is greater than or equal to the market value of the currency bet by the player. In fact the limitation is counterintuitive to all previous gambling structures

involving a "house." In these prior art gambling structures, a player, on average, will take home less than they bet. This is how a house makes money. However, in the presently amended claims, the **opposite** is true and the player, on average makes money gambling.

This is a counterintuitive and novel teaching of Applicant's invention. Prior to the teachings of Applicant, if a player bets $100 then the market value (on average) received by that player in both scrip and cash will be less than $100 for that bet. Weiss teaches nothing beyond this typical entrance-exchange construction. In other words, Weiss may teach "comping" a player, but the market value of these comps, combined with the market value of the cash that a player wins on average is still less than the player's bet.

In contrast, the present invention claims a structure wherein a player may bet $100 and receives on average, for example, scrip worth $40 **and** cash worth $70, combining for a total market value of $110. Again, this average return is **greater** or equal to the player's bet of $100. Essentially, the present invention teaches that the player sacrifices the autonomy of cash (being able to spend-able on virtually anything) for scrip (being spend-able only at participating vendors). A vendor may then work out a deal with the house such that 1$ of scrip is worth $0.50 cash. Thus, the entrance exchange structure of the present invention may result in reduced profits for the vendor. However, a vendor may desire to enter into this arrangement with a house because of the increase in demand at the vendor resulting from the fact that the scrip has a limited number of scrip-accepting vendors. None of the cited references teaches this unexpected and counterintuitive entrance-exchange structure whereby a player takes home, on average, currency worth greater than or equal to what they bet.

In light of the arguments made hereinabove, Applicant respectfully contends that claims 1, 41, 93, 124 are not unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Weiss in view of the

OFFICIAL NOTICE and that claims 1, 41, 93 and 124 are in condition for allowance. Likewise, because claims 2-21, 26-34, 37, 42-61, 66-74, 77, 94-104, 109-117, 120, 125-135, 140-148, 151, and 155-159 depend from claims 1, 41, 93, and 124, Applicants respectfully contend that claims 2-21, 26-34, 37, 42-61, 66-74, 77, 94-104, 109-117, 120, 125-135, 140-148, 151, and 155-159 are in condition for allowance. Applicants therefore respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

The Examiner also rejected claims 22-25, 35-36, 38-40, 62-65, 75-76, 78-80, 105-108, 118-119, 121-123, 136-139, 149-150, 152-154, and 160-164 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Weiss (U.S. Patent No. 6,511,377 B1) and further in view of Walker (U.S. Patent App. 2003/0060276). Because claims 22-25, 35-36, 38-40, 62-65, 75-76, 78-80, 105-108, 118-119, 121-123, 136-139, 149-150, 152-154, and 160-164 depend from claims 1, 41, 93, and 124, Applicants respectfully contend that claims 22-25, 35-36, 38-40, 62-65, 75-76, 78-80, 105-108, 118-119, 121-123, 136-139, 149-150, 152-154, and 160-164 are also in condition for allowance. Applicants therefore respectfully request the Examiner withdraw this rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

## CONCLUSION

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicant respectfully believes that all pending claims and the entire application meet the acceptance criteria for allowance and therefore request favorable action. If the Examiner believes that anything further would be helpful to place the application in better condition for allowance, Applicant invites the Examiner to contact Applicant's representative at the telephone number listed below. The Director is hereby authorized to charge and/or credit Deposit Account 19-0513.

Date: November 11, 2009

/Arlen L. Olsen/

Arlen L. Olsen
Registration No. 37,543
Customer No. 05409

Schmeiser, Olsen & Watts
22 Century Hill Drive, Suite 302
Latham, New York 12110
Telephone (518) 220-1850
Facsimile (518) 220-1857
E-mail: aolsen@iplawusa.com